UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes
Editor in Chief

Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese
Associate Editors

Is Progress an Illusion?

By EDMUND B. CHAFFEE

Religion on the Air

By JOSEPH ERNEST McAFEE

War and the "Pacifist Delusion"

By H. F. REVES

Joseph Smith and Plato

By MAY STRANATHAN

VOLUME CX NUMBER 10

Chicago, November 21, 1932

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly October to June — *Subscription $3.00*
Published Bi-Weekly July to September — *Single Copies 10 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, July 30, 1931, at the Post office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
LOUIS L. MANN, CURTIS W. REESE, *Associate Editors*

Board of Directors
MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON, Treasurer
MRS. ELLA R. NAGELY
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Board
W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
RAYMOND H. PALMER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors
LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
PERCY M. DAWSON
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
M. C. OTTO
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

Foreign Representatives
AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page
Notes 147
Is Progress an Illusion?—EDMUND B. CHAFFEE 149
Jottings.—J. H. H. 151

ARTICLES—
Religion on the Air—JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE 152
War and the "Pacifist Delusion"—H. F. REVES 153
A New Note in American Art—W. 155
Joseph Smith and Plato—MAY STRANATHAN 156

POETRY—
The Christ to India—ELSA TUDOR 147
I'd Like to Be a Soldier—LON RAY CALL 158

THE STUDY TABLE—
New Books—FREDERICK STARR 157

CORRESPONDENCE—
Do Not Forget Mooney—GEORGE L. THOMPSON 159
Good Cheer—STELLA DEWART 159

THE FIELD—
Gandhi Walks in Geneva—SYDNEY STRONG 146

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Gandhi Walks in Geneva

[From Our Special Correspondent]

Gandhi was walking in Geneva last week, in broad day-light—but, except to a few, without observation. City business went on as usual. Matthew was receiving taxes at the custom-seat. The markets were full of bartering housewives and Lake fishermen. The merchants were trading in the Council Chamber of the Temple. The Sanhedrin of the Nations was engaged in discussion of the Law and the Covenant, as well as tithing mint and anise. The rulers at the Hotel de Ville were anxious for fear of the common people. The daily journal was bringing to the Burgers weather reports, situation on the high seas and discussing socialism, religion and the League of Nations—which last brought no little business and wealth to the craftsmen. Citizens from Athens, Rome, Jerusalem, Calcutta, Tokyo, London, Moscow, Washington, Canberra and the Islands of the Sea jostled each other on the Quai Wilson, and were eating and drinking—as in the days of Noah.

Gandhi came to Town, but no feasts were spread for him, as for De Valera, and no mention of him in the daily journal. To a few who asked: "Who art thou?" came the response, "I am the Voice crying in India, make straight the Way of the Lord!" And certain of the members of the Sanhedrin—scribes, rulers, Pharisees, Saducees—named Paul, Samuel, Joseph, Simon Peter, Nicodemus, John, Andrew—declared, that they were looking for another, one clad in bright armour, a gas-mask, and the sword of Jehovah.

The citizens of Geneva were seeing a show by the British Players in "Musical Chairs," or watching their Firemen on Sunday (shades of Calvin!) testing the new fire-escape chutes, or showing visitors the grand Reformation Monument, or discussing peace and disarmament, while the statesmen were engaged in making and solving puzzles—and lo, a saviour was in their midst.

Some of the inner circle were moved to celebrate his birthday—on October 1st—also Hindenburg's natal day. Gandhi's birthday will be remembered ages to come when Germans will "study war no more." The chapel of the American Church was granted by the kind-hearted pastor, and it was filled with friends of Gandhi—invited by Mrs. Bose and Mr. Saran, of India. Little was said about him, but he walked about the room, in spirit and reality—being the Idea and Inspiration of the evening—though faraway and in a prison-cell. The design of a huge spinning-wheel, as a symbol, was fastened up on the wall. The spinning-wheel promises to have power and healing, like that of the cross, which however has often been a symbol of pride and cruelty. At this birthday party there were no press and photographers, and yet his prison-cell has become a sanctuary, calling millions to judgment. Outside the chapel, the Rhone, like the stream of humanity in the streets, flowed on—

(*Continued on page* 159)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CX MONDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1932 Number 10

THE CHRIST TO INDIA

O India! O my people!
With whom I live and die;
I feel the *lathi* falling,
I hear your bitter cry.

I go to prison with you,
A stinking noisome hole,
I known your gasping nausea,
Your agony of soul.

Though there must be offenses,
To the offender woe:
And those who torture India
Will suffer and will go.

Oppressed and heavy-laden
Ye are, and so am I!
O India! O my people!
With whom I live and die.

Elsa Tudor.

There are two reasons why we shall not take good space in this paper to comment at length on the election. One is that, owing to editorial exigencies, our comment is belated. We can add nothing to what has been abundantly said in one way or another during the past fortnight. Our second reason is that, after the election just as before, we see nothing in the proceeding calling for any particular interest or excitement. A sham battle, fought between two parties which have neither ideas nor principles, and which present no constructive policy of change, was determined by the votes of citizens who were moved not by intelligence but by childish grouch, and put in office an amiable, honest but basically weak candidate surrounded by a typical crowd of politicians hungry for the spoils of office. This is lamentable. But in essentials nothing is changed. We are faced with the same problems, burdened with the same distresses, blasted with the same hopes deferred, as though Herbert Hoover had been returned to office. The electoral outcome, therefore, simply has no significance worthy of serious attention, save as it demonstrates the moronic dependence of the voters on the two-party system, and their inexhaustible willingness to be deceived by the blithe promises of the latest demagogue. For President Hoover we have profound sympathy. We believe him to be sincere, able, devoted, hard-working. He failed not in causing the depression, but in not conquering it, which no man could have done. For Governor Roosevelt we have fear and utter misgiving, exceeded only by the contempt we feel for the so-called progressives of the Norris, Wheeler, La Follette stripe, who joined the tabloid masses of city and farm in allowing themselves to be "fooled again." Roosevelt was tested by the depression as Governor, just as Hoover was tested as President. If the latter struggled earnestly and futilly, the former, with incomparable gaiety, did nothing at all. He will continue to do nothing at all, save talk and smile. The people get as good government as they deserve, we are told—and they'll get it the next four years!

The election hullabaloo, which matters not at all save as it makes an already bad situation as much worse as human stupidity can accomplish, should not be allowed to obscure the decision of the U. S. Supreme Court in the Scottsboro case, which affects the destinies of justice and liberty in this country to the end of time. The facts in this notorious case are known not only here but abroad. A group of seven Negro boys, charged by mob rage with rape, were condemned to death under conditions which made any fair judgment of the facts utterly impossible. A jury, intimidated by a milling crowd of ten thousand men and women yelling for blood, heard charges unsupported by evidence and tested by no properly prepared defense, and presented a verdict which was obviously the simple registering of passion, prejudice, and fear. The whole proceeding was a lynching under guise of law. Now the Supreme Court at Washington, following its historic precedent in the Arkansas case, stamps the whole trial as an open violation of the "due process" guaranteed by the Constitution to even the humblest citizens in the land. The specification of the wrongs done these helpless Negro boys by the officers of state, as enumerated by Justice Sutherland and concurred in by six of his associates, makes a damning indictment of justice as administered in this republic. Whether the prisoners are guilty or not is quite beside the point. The Court emphasizes that they are to be presumed innocent until proved guilty, and that proof, if available, must be offered under conditions which will guarantee to defendants a fair trial. So the case, by authority of the highest judicial tribunal in the land, must be reopened and retried. Here is vindication of the best that lies within our democratic form of government—liberty under law, and even justice in the

law. And the Supreme Court, denounced again and again as the instrument of reaction and tyranny, is here the protector of the lowest and weakest among us. There was irony in the spectacle of a mob of "reds" picketing the Court in expectation of a decision which would condemn these boys to death. The familiar dogma of proletarian persecution somehow failed to work!

Washington had its "bonus march," and London its "hunger march." Both marches were fundamentally of the same character, even to the predominance of veterans in the ranks, and thus it is interesting to compare the action of the authorities in the two places. In Washington there was a loose hand from the beginning. The marchers were allowed to do anything they pleased—camp on public ground, seize private property, invade the Capitol and other public buildings, prey on the citizens, and in general "own the place." At last, when the presence of the bonus raiders became impossible, for sanitary reasons if for no other, the army was called out and the city swept clean. It was the suddenness and terror of this final explosion of exasperated officials which really caused all the uproar against Hoover and his aides. Weakness, ending in fury, was the dominant note. In London there was a very different policy. Immediately upon the arrival of the marchers, the police were in control with a hand as firm as iron. No camping in open spaces was allowed for a moment. Every facility for protest meetings was provided at the historic spots in Hyde Park and Trafalgar Square under full police protection, but no invasion of public buildings was permitted. The instant the raiders threatened to get out of hand, their leaders were all arrested, and attempts to reach Buckingham Palace and the House of Commons were met by charging horses and swinging batons. No one scene in London was as terrible, we imagine, as that last day of fighting in Washington, but, apart from the two deaths in the latter city, we feel that there was much more head-splitting and blood-letting and general rioting across the seas than here. But of course the English situation was much more serious, and the police problem therefore much more difficult. Whether the firm or the easy method is the wiser, we cannot say. On the whole, so far as results are concerned, we think London and Washington are about quits. The main point is that hunger demonstrations have begun early, and, as the winter goes on, will multiply. There are bad times ahead.

Anybody who wants to take the measure of Secretary of War Hurley is earnestly invited to look into the second "Washington Merry-Go-Round" volume, which incidentally we hope is going to be a serial publication. All the sham and ineffable vanity of the man are there beautifully disclosed. Also an essential vulgarity which never fails to appear in a person of this type, especially when he swells in the glory of public office! But we doubt if anything known to the anonymous author of the "Merry-Go-Round" chapter on Hurley surpasses a recent episode at a political rally in Philadelphia, at which the Secretary was the chief speaker. The orator was ridiculing the Democratic attempt to blame the President for all the evils of our time. This was a justifiable thrust, and should have made a deep, clean wound. But Mr. Hurley is not a man to do anything in noble fashion. So he befouled his weapon with the ineradicable cheapness of his own nature. This is what he said:

> The distinguished and amiable gentleman who is the candidate on the Democratic ticket (the Secretary said) has charged the Republican party and the Republican President with all the ills that ever have or ever will beset the human race. The only thing that Governor Roosevelt hasn't charged President Hoover with concerns a man who wears a sheet and big horn-rimmed glasses. The Governor has not charged the President with taking Mahatma Gandhi's pants.

We recall that, on the occasion of the Mahatma's visit to London last fall, a vaudeville theatre put on a vulgar skit, exploiting in ribald terms the native characteristics of the great Hindu. Immediately the government interfered, and ordered the indecent act from the boards. Secretary Hurley should have been silenced for similar indecency by orders straight from Washington. Yet we should not be too harsh in our criticism of this unimportant man. For, after all, he is not so much unique as typical of large areas of that American public mind which is so ignorant, shallow, and crude. Gandhi has long been a subject of jest in theatres and even on the radio, and people laugh. We haven't a doubt that Secretary Hurley's statement was greeted with great hilarity by his audience. The American people will joke about anything—we don't know what it is to be serious or reverent. Gandhi's recent fast did more to break down the barriers of ignorance and prejudice than any one thing the Mahatma has ever done. At last the public began to glimpse the glory of this man! Perhaps the time is not far distant when we shall all understand and hail him as the modern Christ.

The sudden death of Will Levington Comfort, novelist, is a loss to American letters, and incidentally a sad loss to Unity. Mr. Comfort won distinguished recognition as an author nearly twenty years ago, and sustained his high reputation with each succeeding book. In 1922 he came into direct touch with us through the novel published in that year which dealt with India and Gandhi. This was the first time, we think, that the Mahatma found his way into our contemporary literature, and we would emphasize that it was at a time when Gandhi was little known to our western world. It was in this same period that Mr. Comfort's interests began to spread beyond his chosen

field of fiction. Suddenly, to an ever growing circle of friends and followers, he revealed himself as a mystic —a seer whose vision penetrated deep and reached high in quest of the secrets of the spirit. These secrets seemed to become as though revealed to him. He began to share his meditations and discoveries in a series of letters to his widely-scattered group of disciples. They were like the letters of Paul sent out in the Apostle's crowded days to the little bands of Christians scattered like flung seeds through the Roman Empire. Then Mr. Comfort began the publication of his unique and remarkable paper, the *Glass Hive*. In an age of gross and arrogant materialism, Will Levington Comfort lived and wrote as "the still, small voice" of the spirit. UNITY seemed to bring him companionship. When the *Glass Hive* suspended publication, he offered us his writings, and only last month we printed an article from his pen, "A Privilege of the Gods" (October 17th), which made a profound impression. We invited him to join our group of Editorial Contributors. And then, without warning, he died! Alas that he should go—and his exalted voice be stilled!

Is Progress An Illusion?

There are many who tell us that the rise and fall of civilizations are merely so many performances on the world's stage. The players are changed; the scenery shifts; the style of acting is altered; but no matter how many performances are given the play is always the same and will remain the same to the end of time. Progress is an illusion. Human history goes around in circles. We are always going but never arrive, or, more properly, we arrive at our starting point. What is the truth about this? Is there social progress or is there not?

To get anything like a scientific answer to this question we must recognize the futility of comparing our present day with this or that particular age that is past. By looking first at Greece and then at Babylon or then turning to the ancient Mayas of Yucatan it is quite possible to make a case either for progress or against it just as you may prefer. We can find plenty of generations which seemingly had better bodies than we, plenty that had worse. We can find generations which had better art than we and plenty that had worse. We can find ages which surpassed ours in literature and ages which we surpass. We can by picking and choosing prove human progress or we can just as readily disprove it. The problem cannot be solved in this way. It can be solved only by looking at man's whole career upon this planet. But the trouble is that we do not know that whole career. If that period of time, several hundreds of thousands of years ago, since Pithecanthropus Erectus first appeared be represented as the life of a man now forty-eight years old we should be forced to admit that we know next to nothing about this individual's career before his forty-fifth or forty-sixth year. In other words, so short is the span of history we know only the last two years of man's life and of that portion we know well only the events of the last two or three months.

But when we do take this long view what do we see? On this let me quote a recent writer:

> On one side, in the remotest past, we see a savage half human being, ignorant of the simplest general laws of nature, unaided in his struggle against external forces and hostile beasts except by his own right arm and his mother wit, isolated in his cave or forest from other tribes of future men, ignorant of everything not met with in the daily hunt or the nightly lair. At the other end comes the modern man, with his animal senses less acute, his muscular force inferior to his savage ancestors, yet intellectually, socially, collectively so developed that the gap between him and the Urmensch seems even greater than that between the Urmensch and the next of the Primates. And this development of the modern from the primitive man can be quite surely analyzed at least in its leading features. The modern compared with the primitive is immeasurably more powerful, more knowing both of himself and all other things, more united as a world being and conscious of this being and of the universe in which it moves. That man has started from the one state and come to the other is certainly an historical fact whether we call it progress or not.

That there has been this tremendous change since those early days of the ape man no one can deny. That these changes have been in a direction we call good is not so self evident. Yet it is upon the answer to that question that our problem today depends. In other words to answer our question as to whether progress is real or is an illusion we must decide what tests we are to apply, how we are to measure the changes which have admittedly taken place. To lay down these tests is not easy. Yet among those possible tests there are five that seem to merit consideration. Those tests are knowledge, material well being, power over nature, artistic appreciation and social conscience. In other words, during man's long career has he come to know more; does he have more; can he do more; does he appreciate more keenly; is he kinder to his fellows? Let us look at these questions for a few moments.

Does the man of today know more? Unquestionably he does. He has learned much about the universe he is in. He knows that the earth goes round the sun and that the sun itself is a star in the midst of a cosmos of staggering proportions. He knows that his life is connected with all life, that the human species is but one of thousands of species upon this planet. He has been able to trace his own development down the vast corridor of time. He knows something of how life develops and how it is based upon the cell. In field after field his knowledge is immeasurably greater than it was in those far off days when he first learned to walk erect. If knowledge be our test then surely taking this long view there is progress.

Or if we ask the question, does man have more? —again we must answer in the affirmative. Certainly

in those regions where the use of high power machinery is advanced men have more things than they have ever had before. The proof of this is found in the ability of the industrial countries of our era to support great populations. There are more people in the world today than there have ever been before. The famines which have been known all through the long course of history are in our day almost eliminated. At least they do not come where the machine is known and used. The average man, moreover, has a greater quantity and a larger variety to eat than the average man has ever had before. He has facilities for keeping his body clean greater than in any other age. He has better clothing, clothing which can be adapted to the changing seasons such as primitive man did not have. Probably all would admit that there is more material well being in our day than there was in those early days of mankind or indeed in any other age.

Once more, if we ask whether man can do more than before?—the answer is obvious. He can go on the water or he can go under the water. He can span the great rivers with his bridges which will hold almost any load put upon them. He can send his voice across the seas or over the land. One man can speak so that millions can hear his very words. He can record his voice so that posterity may hear long after his death. He can race upon the ground or he can fly in the air. He no longer must cease his activity when night comes for he can press a button and lo there is light that almost rivals the sun. He no longer must huddle in a cold cave or in a rude hut; he can heat his building and he can provide for his every comfort. The quickness of his transportation gives him access to the products of all the climes. His food can be varied for the products of the whole world are his. If the standard of progress be material well being then certainly progress has taken place. It is not an illusion.

If the test be artistic appreciation the answer is not so obvious. Unquestionably those reindeer men who made the drawing of the deer and the mammoth in the caves some fifty thousand years ago had artistic appreciation. Yet one would not contend that these drawings were the equal of the paintings of a Rembrandt or the sculpture of a Phidias. And it is entirely reasonable to believe that with the spread of education which has come in our day there is more opportunity for the artistic sense to develop in the soul of the average man than in the days when man was still a hunter or a keeper of flocks and herds. It is quite likely that on this test too we may register change in a direction we believe to be good.

When we come to the moral field and ask whether men are kinder to their fellows we believe here too the answer must be Yes. There is every reason for thinking that in those far off prehistoric days as well as in the days which history can describe to us there was less human kindness than there is today. It was the rule of club and spear. In a sense it still is; we are still governed by force and yet it is encouraging to note that we are becoming more doubtful of the rightness of it. It appears to be the fact that there are more men who are kind at heart and who wish to do well by their fellows. Ever since the days of slavery which probably began when men learned to work in iron and so could forge the ball and chain which held the slave there have been mighty prophets to protest against it. As a system chattel slavery is gone though the results are still with us. From the time of Moses and on through the time of the Hebrew monarchy there have been prophets of social righteousness who were ready to protest against the evils they saw about them, the oppression of the weak by the strong, the poor by the rich. Those daring leaders did not quail in the face of intrenched wrong but said boldly that God himself was on the side of the slave and the captive. If we look at ancient Rome and see how the slaves were crucified, 20,000 of them along the great highway as a warning to the rest, crucified by stakes driven through their back and out through their mouths we know that our own day does not produce such wholesale cruelty as that. Moreover there is a rising conscience about child labor and prostitution, poverty and other age old and intrenched wrongs. Judged by this test of kindness there is change in a direction which meets our approval. There is progress.

To sum it up then: This question must be viewed on the basis of man's whole history, that which is written and that far longer period which is unwritten. When we do take this long view and compare what man is today with what he was when he first appeared we are struck with certain facts. He does know more. He does have more. He can do more. He does seem to have a keener appreciation of beauty. He is kinder. There does seem to be progress. But to all this I know that many will say: You haven't given us the slightest proof than man is any happier than he was then, possibly he isn't as happy as when a free man he roamed the forests. To this I reply you may be right. Whether man is happier or not is something that must remain in the field of speculation. We cannot tell for we cannot look into the minds of the men of today and much less can we look into the minds of the men of those far off prehistoric days when men fought the sabre toothed tiger and the giant ox. There is no way to answer that question. All we can do is what we have done today, look at some tests which are capable of measurement. We cannot tell whether man is happier or not but we can know whether he has more or less of those things which seem to most of us to contribute to human happiness.

But in saying that progress is not an illusion there are two words of caution that must be uttered. The

first of these is that the only progress that seems to emerge from our discussion is social progress, the progress of human society as a whole. This does not imply that man for man we are any better in any of our abilities and capacities than were the men of the ancient world or the men of the dim, prehistoric past. Those men had just as fine bodies as ours, possibly better and they had just as much brain. If we excel them in our knowledge and power and in our moral instincts it is only because we are standing upon their shoulders. We have a vast social inheritance into which we have entered. We start in our childhood as supermen in that we have the accumulated wisdom and power of the ages at our disposal. Social progress does not mean that man for man we have more natural ability than our ancestors a thousand generations ago.

My second caution is to remind you that though it is reasonably certain that man has progressed since first he became man we cannot be sure that this advance will continue. We may go on from height to height or we may not. In fact it is possible that there may come a great war of such magnitude as to wreck humanity. It is possible that there may come a social cataclysm that will throw us back into barbarism. We may descend the hill of progress considerably faster than we went up. There is no evidence to show conclusively that continued progress is the inevitable course for the human race. There are reasons for thinking that even our boasted civilization with all its science may not last much longer. It is possible that we have gone as far as we can go with the inductive method. Spengler may be right in this. Moreover, we may be overthrown by the insect world.

And yet I am one who believes that we have to no small extent our destiny in our own hands. As Shakespeare puts it, "It lies with ourselves whether we are thus or thus." Through grim determination we can remedy the evils we see about us; by a lavish expenditure of human labor and human intelligence we can make progress real. There is no automatic principle at work which will insure it; the issue is for us to decide. If we can learn how to live together without war; if we can learn how to distribute the good things of life so that all shall have and none shall want; if we can learn how to eradicate that hold over from slavery, social inequality, it will be possible to rise to heights which are now unvisioned. For there is the time in which to do it. Our astronomers promise us millions upon millions of years before the sun runs down. It may prove possible for us to attain something like bodily perfection, such vibrant health as the race has never known. It may prove possible too for us to have a society which is veritable brotherhood where at last happiness shall be the lot of every man. Indeed the prospect that looms before us today is more inspiring than it has ever been before. In fact that prospect brings to mind those words of that great intellect and courageous soul, the apostle John. When he thought of our human kind, he said, "Beloved now are we the sons of God and it doth not yet appear what we shall be."

EDMUND B. CHAFFEE.

Jottings

A Massachusetts Legionnaire, who has dared to criticize the bonus grab, is faced with the terrible possibility of being placed on trial by his "buddies," and, if guilty, dismissed from the Legion for life. This is the best news we have heard from the Legion in a long time, for it shows that, in this particular at least, the organization is in the true American tradition. Thus was George Washington "dismissed for life" from the English army when he took up arms against the iniquities of George III.

A mile-high mountain, says a newspaper report, has been discovered under the sea off the coast of California. That mountain must feel like one of our big business men!

Our newspapers are exulting over the decline of the Hitler vote in the recent German elections. But their joy comes hard when the Nazis' losses nearly all went over to the Communists, and they themselves remain overwhelmingly the strongest party in the Reich.

Roosevelt's program for the next four years, in spite of all charges of evasion, was made perfectly plain during the campaign. That program is the same as the title of the movie—"Smilin' Through." The President-Elect thinks a smile can do it. All right! We shall look at his face with interest two years hence.

Italy, at one stroke, retired 130,000 tons of her fighting ships—one-third of her navy—in order to save money. So there *is* a way, a method, a formula for disarming, when one *has* to disarm. And it's a very simple way—namely, DISARM! Let the Geneva Conference take notice.

Ironies of Circumstance: (7)—that when we come to that time of life when we are at last prepared to do our best service and exert our strongest influence, we come at the same time to that time of life when our physical strength begins at last to wane.

J. H. H.

Religion on the Air

Really, somebody ought to do something about current presentations of religion to the radio audience. Striking an average through the welter of jazz music, sedulous imitations of "Amos 'n' Andy," sketches, comic, tragic, and "historical," indescribable intellectual and emotional junk which is offered the radio listeners, it is evident that a median level of moronic intelligence is aimed at. Perhaps the religious program is provided as a soporific to go along with all this insanity. Little of the religion presented imposes a tax upon the intellect, and it is well designed to put to sleep any listener of whatever intellectual caliber.

Stanley High, who a short while ago was electrifying audiences from coast to coast with his enlightened interpretations of moral and spiritual issues, is one of the high lights in this radio religious program. He has apparently lost his electricity. He supplies what he and his announcer denominate the religious news of the day. He is sponsored by city, county, and state church federations and by the Federal Council of churches, in a coast-to-coast hookup. He started the other day with what he flourished as a choice bit of news, telling of a group of ministers in a town in the southwest, four or five Protestants, the Roman Catholic priest and the Jewish rabbi, who have formed a club and are meeting regularly for the study of the Bible. Think of it! The entire religious ministry of a town has so far awakened to the challenging social and spiritual issues of these stressful times that they are jointly and perhaps severally studying their two-thousand-year-old scriptures! Let us hope that following this startling achievement they will pass on to such live issues as medieval architecture and the number of angels who may dance on the point of a needle.

Mr. High seized upon the 111th anniversary of the birth of George Williams to commend the world-wide work of the Y. M. C. A., thus showing that the propagandists have already recognized the values in Mr. High's function. Presumably what gave this particular anniversary importance is that it occurs only once in 111 years. He noted that a new group of mountain climbers are proposing to attack the Himalayas on the borders of Tibet. This suggested the profoundly religious observation that the Dalai Lama is still on the job of making it difficult for outlanders to move about in that part of the world. Which enabled him to work in the story of an acquaintance of a half dozen years or a decade ago who defied the prohibitions of the Lama once too often in his zeal to spread good American Methodism in the Lama's domain, and was never heard of afterwards. Mr. High seemed peeved that while the Lama has achieved a fountain pen, and automobile and perhaps a white cravat from western civilization he stubbornly refuses to substitute in his realm ages-old Christianity for his more-ages-old Buddhism.

In twirling the finder-needle on the radio I stumbled into a church service where the preacher had evidently taken Jonah and the whale as his text. He found that a number of things today have been thrown overboard. He must have set forth an array of them before I arrived. Their loss is all to the good. For which we are to thank the depression. For some occult and unnamed reason he had just discovered that religion is not one of these, and he seemed greatly pleased. Religion is bound to survive no matter who may have been disposed to toss it overboard. This assurance presumably comes out of the consciousness that the religion he was presenting is so light and dry that it will float even upon the tempestuous seas which now prevail.

The announcement of Rabbi Wise's Yom Kippur sermon looked very promising in the schedule of one of the stations. At the hour appointed it came out of the machine, with prayer, partly in Hebrew, running announcements of the Free Synagogue, and all. Rabbi Wise's voice is enormously impressive. When he declares that the Men's Club will hold a meeting on Wednesday evening, it sounds like an edict of state. And when he rolls out in unintelligible Hebrew a psalm or a paragraph from one of the prophets one imagines that the Lord God Jehovah is ringing out his message direct. When Webster visited England and Carlyle saw him, he remarked, "No mortal can be as Daniel Webster looks." When one hears the voice of Rabbi Wise, even though his leonine presence is lacking, one is sure that no human being can be as eloquent as Rabbi Wise sounds. Eloquent he did, indeed, sound on this occasion, but the substance of what he said had little relevancy to the pressing issues of today. On this occasion Rabbi Wise was Talmudic. One resounding thwack upon Jimmy Walker and the corrupt government of his city, which he knows so well how to administer, reveals more of the flaming Hebrew prophet come to life in our day than all his sayings on Yom Kippur, though the day were multiplied to 365 in the year.

The church federations sponsor a period devoted to "songs of the church." The other day the period was wholly devoted to Sunday school jingles and the musical patter of free-lance evangelists. There was not one selection from a composer above fourth or fifth grade, and the poetry was pathetic doggerel. Now, these are, more's the pity, the songs of the church, but the church has also a repertoire of real poetry and music, upon which draft might be made if the sponsors of this hour chose. It is unfortunately true that some otherwise intelligent folk, on account of early association or for some other reason, really like this sort of stuff. President McKinley was said to be addicted to it, and the family insisted that one of his "favorites" should be used at the funeral. The title and constantly reiterated phrase in this selection was, as I recall, "O beautiful isle of somewhere." This doggerel was actually inflicted on a public which already had enough to bear in the loss of a beloved chief executive. When people like that sort of thing the sufficient explanation is that that is the sort of thing they like, but official ecclesiasticism is certainly hard up when these can be advanced as typically the "songs of the church."

Numerous religious services are to be heard on the air, from the twangy harangues of come-outers to the sonorous ritual of the Roman Catholic church. One hears dreary intonations in Latin and Hebrew, nasal chantings by poorly trained Protestant choirs, a worthy Protestant divine thanking the good Lord that so many have "come out" since his church began broadcasting, and sermons which have about as much relevance to urgent matters of faith and morals today as if they were uttered by medieval prelates. A boy choir presents impressive renderings of great anthems of the ages. A boy soloist is given a part which would challenge the skill of an accomplished female soprano. The

performance is amazing. But one wonders whether the laws against child labor cannot be invoked when one thinks of all which is involved, the long weary rows of youngsters waiting for their part in a tedious service not ten sentences of which have any significance whatever for them. A boy choir is doubtless a wonderful thing, and the musical training must be valuable for the youngsters, but the music they produce is certainly not the spontaneous and joyous cry of normal childhood. I never see a boy choir in a ritualistic church but I think of their juvenile companions lined up before machines in textile mills. And when one realizes that the ecclesiastical usage which puts them there, instead of the matured female voices for which the music is really adapted, is a superstition from ages even darker than these, one wonders "How long, O Lord!"

Yet the tale is not so doleful as this sounds. Official religion makes a bad showing, but essential religion breaks through at numerous points and expresses itself through various channels. On the esthetic side, a rich choice of the great music by the masters of all the generations back to Bach is to be had. Each week any listener, by turning his station finder-needle here and there, can have two hours with Toscanini and his New York Philharmonic orchestra; an hour and a half with Stokowsky and his Philadelphia Philharmonic; an hour with Damrosch and his orchestra in his musical interpretations now put on on a coast-to-coast hook-up of stations and shared by millions of listeners; a blessed session with Williamson and his Westminster choir; luscious moments with Archer Gibson at the magnificent Schwab organ, accompanied by many of the best vocalists and instrumentalists of New York; recitals from Carnegie Hall's powerful organ; a large number of incidental offerings from highly competent artists, to be picked out of the welter of jazz.

On the ethical side religion suffers here as always. But the real thing is frequently breaking through. Here and there among the banal sketches one may occasionally discover a flash of human insight and inspiration which is more valuable for the young than a whole session of a conventional Sunday school. Some Shakespeare and other creditable drama is occasionally to be had. Necessarily stripped of tawdry scenic effects some of the presentations are sheer inspiration, done by competent speakers.

Maybe, after all, official religion would best be allowed to run on down its steep place into the abyss, so that place may be given in the radio program for unofficial essential religion which makes its own way even through such morasses as the inane advertisements of tooth-paste, shaving-cream and pork sausage with which the radio program is deluged. When religion emerges out of such conditions it is usually the real thing. Pearls are sometimes found under the feet of swine.

JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE.

War and the "Pacifist Delusion"

That war can and should be modified in practice, but that it cannot be avoided is the common contention of people who cannot quite accept pacifism. They usually follow this up with the statement that belief in the practicability of pure pacifism is not only a delusion but a menace to the safety of the world, fostering a false sense of security. If these doctrines are true, the well-intentioned pacifist may well reconsider his position, and return to a safe, middle-of-the-road attitude that shall go no further than gently trying to stop any particular war from starting and trying to keep any that do start on as gentlemanly a plane as possible. Such a stand squarely challenges the entire position of the sincere worker for peace, and dooms all hopes for the ultimate abolition of war.

The whole argument against the possibility of peace is weakened by an attempt to link it up with a contemporary cult of unreality. Popular, unpopular and intellectual beliefs alike have proved unreal in the light of later theory or knowledge since the earliest records of human thought. This age is no more at sea than any other in its worship of false gods. An undue reliance upon partial evidence of science is certainly one prevalent form of unreality. The trend toward a literature of escape from reality is not a contradictory phenomenon. In personal careers, a large portion of the literate public may seek a vicarious satisfaction of desires fostered by modern propaganda through romantic stories and films, but when serious thought is in order upon any subject, the quest is for a correct solution, and not for mere pleasant dreams. Leaders of pacifist thought are hard-headed realists who are willing to face conditions, to acknowledge the difficulties in their path, and to point the way to their removal or acceptance. Pacifism has become pragmatic.

The bloody and brutal character of war has been too often called the first major argument of pacifism. On the contrary, it is one of the slightest, and requires careful qualification to mean much to an intelligent audience. Mere bloodiness in a literal sense is easily disposed of. The term brutality is identified for the argument with a state of emotional rather than intellectual activity. We may fairly accept this, and the further premise that acts of emotion cannot be universally, unqualifiedly condemned. But the reason of man must not long surrender its sway to emotion. Individual exercise of the right of personal freedom of choice in this matter is a very different thing from the organized demand for a collective and long-enforced surrender of reasonable considerations required by the discipline of a modern army. If an individual chooses to act in what we must hereby call a brutal fashion, or if he so acts from impulse without deliberate choice, it is an isolated instance. Society through its various criminal and social codes generally is too ready to condemn any such lapse, save under closely restricted conditions. If a nation in making war acts in this manner, individual choice is merged into the group, and the prolongation of the struggle defies any attempt of the rational faculty to regain control during its duration. It follows that we may unreservedly condemn war as brutal without affecting the judgment of individual cases of similar conduct.

The excuse that brutality is just an epithet to use for general dislike of the soldier as a type need concern us little. A private capitalist on the one hand will of course oppose a soldier-class which may seek to gain power, while the radical upon the other may

condemn the army as the tool of the capitalist. In point of fact, the radical does not usually dislike nor envy the soldier, whom he considers an exploited victim of whatever system he happens to be against. It is too easy in such reasoning to confuse the soldier as a type with the officer. There is a profound psychological and economic difference that has its due effect upon the argument throughout.

In the question whether wars pay, the matter seems to hinge upon the relative values of human life and liberty on the one hand, and financial results on the other. The destruction of life in the Indian wars in this country has resulted in a heavy cost in national honor, for one thing, and has been a matter of occasional shame for our elder statesmen. Just how much territory has to be added to pay for one human life, whether white or Indian, slain to get it, depends upon our own standard of human values. There are other factors which seriously affect the view that any particular war has ever been profitable from the long view of history. The forceful conquest of Indian territory in this country resulted in wasteful exploitation of natural resources and unsound development of the country. A slower expansion by peaceful purchase might have led to more careful development that would have eliminated this tremendous economic waste, if we had realized the value of land paid for in cash and not in lives. In other countries, the organization of the native tribes has not always been profitable; "white men's diseases" have made serious inroads in African colonies. The result has certainly rarely been profitable to the aborigines of the country, but it is to be presumed that pro-war advocates usually mean that war pays only for the victor, despite their occasional assumption of the world point of view. The belief that the money made in this country out of the World War justifies this argument is refuted by the depression of 1921, the collapse of Russia in 1917, and the present plight of Germany with the effect of the reparations problem upon world conditions today.

The religious argument that war itself is sinful is impregnable for any intelligent religious person. In commenting upon the pacifist sayings of Jesus, it is no way out to cite the casuistry of Thomas Aquinas. The sayings cannot be unsaid by trying to soften or excuse their application to particular instances. The argument for pacifism here rests solely upon authority, of course, but within that limitation it is unchallengeable; the citation of a chance contradictory saying we must leave to the theologians to wrangle over. The arguments of Aquinas that there are cases where it is righteous to use the sword, particularly on behalf of the group, are opportunist excuses, perhaps very sensible, but certainly unjustifiable in view of the basic Christian teachings.

That many professed Christians have not been pacifists, and that few Christian sects have taken a pacifist attitude, are a matter for regret, not an argument against the justification of Christian pacifism. Numbers alone do not convince in the realm of ethics. The statement that the Roman Catholic Church cannot move in this direction because it would imply condemnation of former popes who, as temporal princes, had engaged in warfare is as false as the belief that the present pope would condone the offenses of Pope Alexander the Sixth. The character of the Head of the Church is multifold, and a rigid distinction may be drawn between the infallible spiritual guide and the sometimes mistaken temporal ruler. Further, it is entirely too gratuitous an offense of pro-war advocates to seek to minimize the importance of the Society of Friends, the chief Christian pacifists, by calling it a local sect—it is one of the most widespread.

It is cheap sport to quote authorities from "Mike" Donovan and Robert E. Lee to Homer and G. K. Chesterton to show that many people have thought war a good thing, but we cannot say that large groups of people always will. Lacking the gift of prophecy, such a statement must remain sheer speculation. As for large masses of people thinking this way, what few certainties we have from mob psychology seem to show that crowds do not think at all in this sense. The thinking is done by the intellectual leaders, regardless what mass education may achieve in the future. It is to this minority that we must speak, and a fair proportion of them, we may reasonably hope, will base their future views not upon past beliefs but upon living ideas and facts such as the argument of the present controversy. Apparently Bernard Shaw, as one thinking leader, may be cited as remaining an opponent of the idea that war is a good thing, even in 1914-1918, and authorities could be cited *ad libitum* on either side. It is not possible to mislead everyone long.

The reasons for this belief, our opponents say, are founded in a probably instinctive love of excitement and comradeship. War does happen to furnish these things, under some conditions, but there are other and socially more valuable ways of achieving the same conditions. Soviet Russia is using this "war-psychology" to achieve a great economic scheme, for instance. The sublimation of instincts having an occasionally undesirable outlet is a problem for the psychologist, and we have evidence that this may be solved in the near future. It is not necessary to accept in full Carlyle's hero theory in order to show that social action can be intelligently directed. Hence, it is entirely rational to contend that the mass of the people may ultimately be persuaded to believe that war is preponderantly evil. Dwelling upon the actual dangers and discomforts and showing that these have not discouraged people from going to war is no proof that intelligent leadership may not result in ultimate dissuasion. Our intellectual leaders have too generally hitherto betrayed their trust and subserved the war-propaganda machine, misleading the people into thinking only of the few glamorous aspects of war.

The probability that there will ever be complete absence of group-wrongs is probably believed in by few if any practical pacifists; the other alternative, that collective resistance—war—is a supreme evil may readily be defended. The usual crude analogy of the individual attitude of a pacifist to an individually committed wrong to a loved sister is false: The collective wrongs from which may spring the seeds of war are a matter of group action on both sides. The group spirit is more than a composite of individual selves, and has an independent organic nature of its own; moreover, it is lacking in many of the special traits of the individual, and the analogy is far afield. It is not necessary to abolish the police in order to be a pacifist, although many individuals will perhaps take this step. (The effective functioning of the police power through systems of restraint rather than of violent attack is comparable to the use of non-violent non-cooperation by the Indian Congress Party, but again this analogy need not be pressed.) No belliger-

ist has yet presented a single sound argument against the stand of pragmatic pacifism, that non-resistance is preferable to armed conflict. There is no reasoned consideration, for instance, of the practical possibilities of aggressive pacifism, of complete non-cooperation with an invading army. As long as an army must depend upon transportation to its base, for instance, this might occupy a fruitful field for aggressive non-cooperation of a highly successful character. At any rate, it does not do to dismiss the matter with a query about the mere spiritual state of the participants, and the anti-pacificists usually do—they evidently feel, contrary to the fact, that passiveness lowers the morale of a people.

Along the line of the distinction of police and military functions, the difference lies in the fight of the police against individuals, frequently organized into gangs, and of the military against an organized group from without. In the case of civil war, the theory of the ruling class has usually been that the army acts in a police capacity to preserve internal order (witness the disability clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment), and that the organization of the offender—a criminal under sedition laws—is merely of a higher degree.

As to method of policing, it may be boldly stated that no proof has been offered that adequate prevention, as distinct from punishment, of crime cannot be secured without personal violence. Modern criminology is tending in this direction, and the final development remains for the future. However, if we can accept the state as an entity, whether upon some political theory or realistically because of the present organization of peoples, the distinction between police and military is valid, and it is not even necessary to wait for this advance to further the cause of pacifism.

To attack the contention that aggressive war is sinful is to attack a man of straw. Leading pacifist thought today has abandoned the direct attempt to use aggression as a test of rectitude, beyond establishing a definite test of aggression, which has certainly not been agreed upon, in limited application. The way out is to condemn all wars whether aggressive or defensive, and this is the practical stand taken today.

With the attitude of the United States toward the World Court, it is unlikely that this or any other organization of its type would attempt to use force to confirm a decision, as was contemplated by the League of Nations Covenant in 1919 and the recent French proposals for an international police. Yet militarists set up this straw issue as the culminating argument, upon the feeble ground that no such organization could have effective moral suasion. Nationalism is called the chief religion, and it is said that only an impossible miracle can make us international-minded. This is loosely reasoned, and may be answerei by any suggestion of the effective use of suasion without war as a final recourse, based upon the firm stand of a world court or similar body. The embargo and economic boycott are among the possible weapons of peace, and in an organized industrial society perhaps among the most powerful. On the other point, the growth of internationalism is forecast by such historical facts as the medieval allegiance in the universal Church, the creation of one Germany in 1870 from the hundreds of petty states, and the contemporary development of loyalty to the ideal of the British Empire.

The vacillations of the League of Nations in the Asiatic conflict have pointed to its weakness as an effective instrument of pacifism, partly technical and partly due to the prevalence of national feelings. Furthermore, as long as the League remains the instrument to enforce a one-sided peace settlement, it cannot be considered wholly an instrument of justice. But again, the League's great powers of economic suasion have been evident. What is needed is more effective machinery to operate them. Public opinion, even in America, is ready today for a step toward internationalism. It is only the natural refuge of a public, despairing of ever finding a way out of a depression, that turns this same passion back to a defeatist nationalism whose chief memorial will be an absurd tariff fence. The first moratorium gesture received universal praise—we could welcome world treatment of world problems.

Intelligent pacifism can profit by the current trend of thought that war is a desperate remedy for depression by proving its falsity from the last war. This is, moreover, a solemn duty, for this argument is creeping insidiously through our national press. In the radical temper of today, many will accept our ultimate contention that peace, even at any price, is preferable to war. More than this, we must aggressively combat the conditions, wherever we may find them, that lead to war. In our concentration upon the symptom, armaments, we must not forget the cause, blind nationalism.

H. F. Reves.

A New Note in American Art

There was recently shown, in a Salmagundi Club exhibit of paintings, a small canvas bearing the name Robert Strong Woodward. This painting (scarcely larger than my sheet of typing-paper) portrays the nearly empty woodshed of a New England farmstead. An overhanging branch on the right reveals the presence of a sheltering tree. A few lines on the left imply attachment to an unportrayed house. A sensitive person may perceive in this picture intimations of a type of art such as America has not yet produced. One is driven to close questioning—Why is it impossible to pass this painting by? Wherein lies its power? Why does the lightly traced shadow of the tree startle one? Why do Brahms' echoes of an old folk melody drift out of the picture to the ears of the onlooker?

Superficially these reactions seem somewhat fantastic—defying analysis. But let us not abandon the quest too easily. We are told that Robert Strong Woodward has been his own teacher, his sole master. Probably that is his most valuable asset. He has dispensed with Europe, he has dispensed with Masters, he has dispensed with "Works of Art," and has found his inspiration in the nature of things and his mode of expression in the make-up of his own being. It is a hopeful indication that we are learning to discriminate between the real and the factitious, to find that this picture was given a medal at the Boston Art Club exhibit and was at once secured by an art connoisseur for a private collection. New England is to be congratulated upon the possession of so vivid and honest an interpreter.

W.

Joseph Smith and Plato

What has become of the plump little woman who used to tour the land of the free and the home of the brave, giving talks to women only on the iniquity of the Mormons and the indecencies of their marriage service? Can it be that the shame and horror of Senator Reed Smoot when he reads the books of D. H. Lawrence and George Moore have discouraged her as to the power of her disclosures to shock this sophisticated world? However that may be, Mrs. Lulu Loveland Shepherd and her picture of the life of the Latter Day Saints seem to be in the background, and it is doubtful if her account of the Mormon wedding service, with the nuptual rites of Adam and Eve in the Garden of Eden, presented under an obscuring mist, would today furnish a thrill even to a ladies' aid society or a missionary meeting. Mrs. Shepherd's talk would seem quite tame to readers of the emancipated novelists, the plays of Eugene O'Neill, the works of Judge Ben Lindsay, reports of eugenists, birth-controllers, and Freudists.

Like the secrets of the Masons, the Rosacrusians, and other adepts who seek to present the world as a mystery to which they alone have found the key, the revelations of the iniquities of the Mormons were to me, even in the good old days, a distinct disappointment. What matters it to any sane woman whether or not the full-fledged Mormon man wears an undergarment which he must never take off even when he bathes? If his wife can stand it, why should any other women worry, and why should these men beg Mrs. Shepherd not to mention it? And is not this habit better than the one of the Gentile man which is to leave his underwear on the bathroom floor for his wife to pick up?

The most thrilling part of Mrs. Shepherd's talk was the description of Satan himself coming unbidden to the marriage ceremony of the young Mormon couple. He comes up through a trap door, all dolled out in evening clothes, and wearing a high silk hat, according to Mrs. Shepherd, and she said she got her information from a reformed Mormon wife. We hear so little about a real live and active personal devil in these degenerate days of complexes and neuroses that the Mormon devil is a pleasing novelty. And I like the frank way of the Church of the Latter Day Saints in recognizing right at the start his presence at the wedding, instead of ignoring it as the Gentiles so often do until years after when the starting of divorce proceedings brings it to light.

Do you remember the articles which used to be in the magazines, illustrated with the pictures of cute little houses captioned as the dwellings of wife number one, two, three, four, and so on? But what thrill of horror would these or Mrs. Shepherd's stories of the trials of the plural wives hold for the advocates or the practitioners of trial marriages? At their worst they seem but the bunching of the woes of wedlock instead of taking them in installments. And in these days when we seem trembling on the verge of the identification of time and space, why does it make any difference how our troubles come, singly or together?

I wonder if Mrs. Lulu Loveland Shepherd had ever read Plato's Republic and marked the similarity of the Greek philosopher's teachings with those of the crude young man, Joseph Smith, prophet and founder of the Church of the Latter Day Saints, and of his successor, Brigham Young! For Plato, in the fifth book of the Republic proposes for his ideal state laws to secure "that the brave man is to have more wives than others," and he is to have first choice in such matters in order that he may have as many children as possible. With the efforts of the eugenists to prevent the unfit from having children, it seems but the next step to provide that the fit may have as many as possible.

During a visit to Salt Lake City I talked to several of the leading women of the Church of the Latter Day Saints, and while they declare the subject of polygamy a closed one since the laws of the United States forbid it, they likened the plural marriages of the Mormons to the marriages of the patriarchs of the Old Testament. They declared that plural marriages were never allowed except to men and women known for their pure and upright lives and their saintly characters, and that they were contracted only as the result of special revelation which imposed such marriages as a duty for the preservation of the Mormon church in a time of stress and persecution, as well as for the improvement of the stock.

"Are not such marriages in line with the latest discoveries of eugenists?" asked a leader of the work for young women, and she pointed out that Dr. W. A. Evans, of newspaper syndicate fame, is authority for the statement that prophecies made some eighty years ago to the effect that the offspring of plural marriages would be physically and morally degenerate, had been contradicted by the United States Bureau of Statistics.

This woman is Miss Alice G. Reynolds, and it was she who seconded the nomination of William G. McAdoo at the Democratic convention in San Francisco in 1920. Miss Reynolds is prominent in the League of Women Voters, the National Council of Women, and the General Federation of Women's Clubs, having represented her own state at conventions of these bodies.

One would scarcely think of any similarity existing between the teachings of Joseph Smith and Maurice Maeterlinck, but one of the Mormon women pointed out to me the similiarity of their teachings about the unborn. You remember how, in the "Blue Bird," the little souls, eager to go to earth and be born, throng the bank of the river which separates the world of spirits from the world of the earthly, and how grieved they are when the boatman turns them back? The Mormons have some such belief, and an elderly woman, the mother of twelve, thus expounded it to me:

> We believe we were sent here to regenerate the earth. We believe that all souls now on earth have existed in a previous state and that others are now eagerly waiting their turn to come to earth and assume bodies. While we Mormon women have open minds on the subject of birth control and recognize the necessity of restricting births under some conditions, yet we believe that the general adoption of birth control would tend to restrict unduly the opportunity of these waiting souls to experience mortal existence.

Nowhere among the Mormon women, and I talked to some dozen or more of the leaders among them, did I find any prudish or unreasonable attitude toward new ideas or modern life. But there is one thing in which they agree with the late William Jennings Bryan, for the mother of twelve told me, "We take no stock in any such a theory as that immortal souls come from worms or monkeys." This of course could but be the

view of those who agree with the Platonic or Maeterlinckian theory of the previous existence of souls.

If the Mormon women are downtrodden, they do not seem to know it. Several of them told me that no other women in the world have such opportunities, that they have always been given the utmost freedom, and an equal voice with men in business as well as in religious conferences. They remind you that 'way back in 1842, their prophet, Joseph Smith, considered the work of the women of such importance that he called them together and organized the Women's Relief Society, at Nauvoo, Illinois, and that this is one of the oldest organizations for women in the land. It is also the boast of the Mormon women that they have always had woman suffrage in Utah, even before it was a state.

The Women's Relief Society has been a progressive body and through it social service has been developed along much the same lines as in other organizations of women. They have Girl Scouts and other activities, and they claim that hygiene, including sex eugenics, has been taught since the organization of the Church of the Latter Day Saints to both girls and boys, and a single standard of morality insisted upon. As to divorce, they deplore it, while believing it is better than strife and unhappiness in the home.

Miss Reynolds told me that while the younger generation of Mormons do not have the large families of the older generation, neither birth control nor divorce has touched the Mormon communities to the extent they have influenced other communities.

"Our young married people," she said, "are as a rule eager for children, and these children are still Utah's best crop." She reminded me that two former presidents, Roosevelt and Harding, were greeted by thousands of school children when they visited Salt Lake City, and how they both told the citizens they were justly proud of these children, the finest product of the state.

The memory of the pioneer Mormon women who faced the perils and hardships of the journey across an unknown desert to a new home, is preserved in the decorative arts of Salt Lake City. In the mural pictures of the railway station they are shown with their children, riding in ox-carts toward the setting sun, their husbands on foot and driving the plodding beasts. They are shown cooking over the camp fires kindled at nightfall, or rocking rude cradles in lonely cabin homes, rifles ready at hand. These themes are repeated in the decorations of the handsome Capitol building and in the statues in the public square and the parks of the city.

It requires an effort to connect these Mormon women of today with the religion founded by the queer young man who found and lost the plates of gold on which was inscribed the history of the white race on the American continent ages ago—as written by Mormon, the father of the Angel, Maroni, who appeared in the vision and told where the plates of gold were hid.

MAY STRANATHAN.

The Study Table

New Books

Among foreigners who taught in Japan, a few stand out conspicuously and are still remembered by the Japanese. Such are Basil Hall Chamberlain who taught the Japanese their own language and literature through many years, Edward S. Morse who gave direction to biological study and founded the study of prehistoric Japan and Erwin Baelz to whom more than any other man the building of modern medicine upon firm foundations was due. In "Awakening Japan,"[1] we have the diary of Dr. Baelz. Unfortunately it is not a full and continuous record. Baelz wrote when he felt inclined on the occasion of some extraordinary event. The result is that there are many, and sometimes considerable gaps in his journal. These have been more or less adequately filled by the editor with his own material or by extracts from articles or addresses prepared by the Doctor for various audiences at the very time when the gaps occur. The result is a fairly continuous narrative from 1876, when as a young man of 27 years he came to Japan, up to 1905 when he finally returned to Europe. The original diary was written in German. The editing of it has been done by his son, Toku Baelz, child of a Japanese wife. Dr. Baelz had already given promise of achievement before he left Germany; had he remained there he would probably have made a great name. But it is fortunate that his fate led him as it did. In Japan he did a work which probably no one else could or would have done so well. Invited to a chair of physiology and internal medicine at the Imperial Academy of Medicine in Tokyo for a term of two years, he soon made himself felt. He may be said to be the actual founder of Japan's famous School of Medicine, the teacher and trainer of almost every conspicuous professor and practitioner of the early days, the trusted personal physician of the Emperor and the Imperial Family. No foreigner carried more weight or had more intimate relations with important Japanese than he, and this in spite of the fact that the Japanese government was at times openly hostile to Germans and Germany, and with reason. In his work he was building for all time and not for the moment. His diary gives interesting glimpses of the personages and trends of his time. It is particularly interesting for the period of the Russo-Japanese war. Dr. Baelz was the first man to make anthropological examinations of Japanese and to attack the question of their origin from the anthropological side. His paper on the subject has neither been supplanted nor much improved upon. After his return to Europe, Baelz had frequent opportunity to serve Japan by lectures, discussions and articles upon Japanese problems and achievements. In all of these he was the loyal friend and supporter, not bitterly partisan but just and fair. Doctor Baelz died in 1913, soon after the death of his Imperial patient, Meiji Tenno.

A new study of Confucianism lies before us. This time it is by a western-educated Chinese, who shows the string of titles of M. A., LL. B., Ph. D. He is not a mere bookworm but has had practical experience both in educational lines and in actual politics. In the latter field he has been political secretary of the ministry of foreign affairs of the Nationalist Government. He calls his book[2] "an interpretation of the social and political ideas of Confucius, his forerunners and his

1. Awakening Japan. Erwin Baelz. New York: 1932. The Viking Press. 8 vo. pp. xvii-406. Price $5.00.

2. The Political Philosophy of Confucius. Leonard Shihlien Hsu. New York: 1932. E. P. Dutton and Co. 8 vo. pp. xxii-258. Price $3.75.

early disciples." This limitation to the earliest writers is important: the Sage's teachings underwent many transformations in the hands of later scholars and commentators. The author states two purposes in writing his book: (1) to help students both in the Orient and the Occident to understand the social and political psychology of the Chinese people in relation to their social and political developments; (2) to furnish some new viewpoints in political philosophy.

Some of the ideas as presented in the Confucian Classics, which have hitherto been overlooked by modern students may yet come to be generally recognized as valuable contributions to politics.

The author sketches a background of Confucian political philosophy and then takes up one after another such subjects as—The State, Doctrine of Rectification, Political Unity and Organization, The Principle of *Li*, The Principle of Benevolent Government, Functions of the State and Government Regulation, Law and Justice, Democracy and Representation, Doctrine of *Chung Yung*, Social Evolution, Political Progress. We lack space to consider his treatment in detail. In Confucian philosophy human history is to pass through three stages—disorder and savagery, the small tranquility, and the great similarity. So far as China is concerned, the first period lay behind Confucius; she was then, and still is, in the period of the small tranquility; the great similarity lay ahead and still is to be realized. The period of the small tranquility "is characterized by national states and the institution of private property;" the great similarity is "a period of universal brotherhood and of ownership in common." To Prof. Corwin, who writes a foreword for the book,

The most astonishing feature of the Confucian teaching to the modern reader is its anticipation of the Spencerian formula of evolution and its adaptation of this to a theory, or more precisely a programme of progress.

Some of the most important parts of Hsu's book are those that define terms which have only a partial or no exact equivalent in English—such as rectification, *Li* and *Chung Yung*. One of the striking differences between Confucian thought and Western politics is the attitude toward "law." This deserves careful and thorough study. Minimization or absence of "law" does not necessarily involve disorder and disorganization. In the publisher's announcement we are told: "His (Confucius') ideals have persisted for 2,500 years and are still valid for China and the rest of the world today." It is surely China's failure to practice these ideals that is largely responsible for her present condition. Hsu's book is well worth reading and its reading will lead some of us to re-read Chen's "Economic Principles of Confucius and His School." The two taken together will deepen appreciation of Chinese thought and give warrant for hope of the future.

For more than a dozen years experiments have been conducted in the Winnetka (Illinois) public schools, which have attracted wide attention. They have been radical and have shocked some people, teachers and others. They have never been unreasonable or sensational. They have made no especial bid for publicity, but as they have reached results, they have been ready to share these with others, who are aiming at improvement. We have now a book which presents the ideas involved, written by the man who was responsible for them, Carleton Washburne, Superintendent of the Winnetka schools.* Mr. Washburne objects to the term "the Winnetka Plan." It suggests claims to finality and completeness which he and his helpers do not make. They are working for the common good and are ready to give and take, to try and discard, to modify and improve. Their fundamental idea is to adjust the school to the child, to adapt it to individual differences. The first chapter presents basic principles. The curriculum contains two kinds of materials: "Those subjects which we want each child to master must be 'individualized'—there is no other effective way of getting widely differing children to attain a common standard. But those subjects in which children may legitimately differ, or where we want to capitalize on their differences, may be 'socialized'—we classify these as groups and creative activities." At Winnetka they are trying to work out a technique which shall provide for both of these. To gain the first, individualization, they throw recitations and class assignments overboard; they make the child self-instructing and self-correcting. It sounds quaint, does it not? Carried out, it will assure that *every* child (not seriously defective) will do work at the 100 percent grade—a thing that the old system never secured and never can secure. And it is done in half the time of ordinary school sessions so that the other half may be devoted to "socializing" the school. Here we are dealing with those "group and creative activities," which are the target for much of the criticism aimed at these new efforts. The child needs preparation for playing his part in society as much as he needs the individualized reading, writing, spelling, arithmetic and history. If he is properly educated in the individualized lines, the time that the old system wasted, is ample for this new work. Washburne says:

Time can be found through individual instruction. As pointed out in the first chapter, the individual technique itself, by eliminating recitations, by eliminating class assignments, by eliminating unnecessary material from the curriculum, and by making it possible for each child to master each unit as he goes along, clears half the morning and half the afternoon for group and creative activities. We know from careful scientific experimentation that it is possible to so organize the academic work through the individual technique as to have plenty of time for such activities as we have been describing.

We have only touched on general principles—the book goes into specific details in regard to the entire curriculum. It gives practical first steps. It is written with such clarity and directness, is so sane and honest, that no one truly interested in education can afford not to read it.

FREDERICK STARR.

* Adjusting the School to the Child. Practical First Steps. Carleton Washburne. Yonkers-on-Hudson: 1932. World Book Company. 16 mo. pp. xvi-189. Price $1.68.

I'd Like to Be a Soldier

I'd like to be a soldier for an hour.
Tho pacifist in head and heart am I.
And I would choose, if I could have such power,
One task to try.

I would not slay, nor fight for any land,
Nor fire a gun, nor hasten days of doom.
I'd don a sentry's uniform and stand
By Lenin's tomb.

I'd stand as if to symbolize the dead.
No muscle would I move or token give
Of thoughts that raced unchecked within my head.
My soul would live.

LON RAY CALL

Correspondence

Good Cheer!

Editor of UNITY:

Upon renewing my subscription, I'm reminded of an old song—"Oh! I'm Glad I'm in this army and I'll battle for the right."

So glad to be of the rank and file of your valiant band, battling so fearlessly the cause of right;—truth, justice and democracy;—ushering in a "New World Order."

May you ever prosper.

St. Peter, Minn. STELLA DEWART.

Do Not Forget Mooney

To the Editor of UNITY:

While we are busy with the election and all the other causes let us not forget Tom Mooney of San Quentin, California.

The confession of Callicotte, and the breaking down of all the evidence which was used in convicting Mooney, makes it imperative that the unfortunate prisoner either have a new trial or the pardon which he and Billings deserve.

The time has come when the people of the United States can no longer afford to keep silence concerning this great injustice.

Let us make the cry for justice so loud that it can not be ignored.

GEORGE L. THOMPSON.

Dighton Mass.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 146)

not knowing that an Emperor was in the city—a city that is proud to point out the spot where a Caesar had put his foot as he passed, to conquer. How can we build a Temple of Peace?

October 6th will be remembered as the day when 50 people from many lands conferred in the Salle Centrale, talking about Gandhi and India, closing with a public meeting in the evening, adding one more to the 67 international societies in Geneva. It was discovered that in England, Denmark, Germany, France, Belgium, Switzerland, America, Holland—and, in other parts—were individuals, groups, societies, that were feeling the inspiration of Gandhi and sympathizing strongly with India's desire for freedom. It was believed that the time had come for international cooperation. During all of September, Mrs. Margaret E. Cousins (Ireland), Mrs. M. Horup (Denmark), Dr. Edmond Privat (Switzerland)—and others—worked in Geneva preparing for the Conference.

Out of it was born the "International Committee for India," which expressed its sympathy with and gives its active cooperation to the cause of India by peaceful means. It stands for India's right to complete "self-determination."

"It decides to ask the Indian National Congress for a representative and to keep in constant touch with the National Congress."

"The Conference pays homage to Mahatma Gandhi and the thousands of Indian men and women, who have so notably demonstrated a new and alternative method of physical warfare in India's struggle for freedom and hails this method as an essential contribution to disarmament."

The work of the Committee will be "to collect and disseminate authentic information on India, to coordinate the activities of various organizations, and to take such other steps as may appear useful."

The headquarters of the "International Committee for India" will be *Maison Internationale, Geneva.* Of the officers, the President is *Dr. Edmond Privat;* the Executive Secretary, *Mrs. E. Horup.* Correspondence is solicited.

As Honorary Presidents Dr. J. T. Sunderland, Romain Rolland and Mrs. Cousins were named.

The spirit and power of Gandhi were revealed in the evening public meeting, when several hundred were present. He was walking that night. There was revealed the impotence of prison-bars, when turned, as in this case, into a radio set, broadcasting all over earth and heaven. Here is the *Program,* in part:

Mrs. Emmeline Pethick-Lawrence presided. She had come all the way from London on purpose. She said:

"It is for the interest of the West to help solve the trouble, for India is destined to be the mediator. India speaks one of the languages of the West. It is fitting that the cause of India should come to Geneva, a peace-center. There can be no peace without justice. The reforms of the British Government come too late. India has been dependent on Britain for 75 years. How is it possible for a people to adjust themselves to modern life, if dependent? And, while the real leaders of the people are in prison?

"The people have not resorted to violence. They believe that this is the way to victory. They are relying on the heart and conscience of man, while we in the West think we must conquer by violence. The conscience of India has been awakened by Gandhi. Our part is to know the truth, and tell it to others."

Dr. Edmond Privat explained the aim of the new International Committee:

"The chief task is to inform public opinion about the truth on India. When I was in India, I saw the tremendous sacrifices made by thousands of men and women willing to offer their lives or to go to prison without retaliating, in order to touch the heart of the ruling nation. I felt at once that the counter-part in the West was seriously lacking. These sacrifices are not known. It is necessary to bring all these facts to the British people and to public opinion throughout the world in order that pressure should be brought in favor of granting India's freedom. Self-determination is the birthright of every nation.

"It is sometimes said that Indians could not manage their own affairs. Gandhi's fast proves the contrary. The difficult problem, which a foreign government had not been able to solve for more than half a century, has been solved in a few days by Indians themselves with their own methods. If we let them alone they are capable of agreement and of self-government.

"The Committee is not going to be an anti-British Committee. It contains many great friends of England, who admire her culture and her sense of fair play. It is now the time to give fair play to the Indian situation before it is too late and before hatred is created by repression. This is not a domestic affair at all. It concerns the whole future of the relations between the East and the West; and the present method of non-violence is a great contribution to Disarmament. Great Britain has a great responsibility in helping that demonstration by granting now, what she will eventually have to grant in any case."

Mrs. Margaret E. Cousins spoke on the treatment of the prisoners in India. She urged "the release of all non-violent prisoners" and claimed that the principle which obtained elsewhere that politicals should not be treated as ordinary prisoners, should be extended to the followers of Gandhi.

Dr. Jacques DeMarquette, Paris, said:

"The Anglo-Indian crisis is not a matter of concern for India and Britain alone. It is challenging the interest of the whole world. Every honorable man must take position, for two reasons: on the one hand the world has adopted the ideal of freedom for all people, for which the French Revolution was fought, and as formulated by President Wilson of the right of nations to dispose of themselves.

"All Christians should view Gandhi's action with the utmost sympathy. The non-violence teaching of Christianity is ridiculed, as being inapplicable to practical life. If Gandhi succeeds in his challenge of violent methods, he will have vindicated the teaching of Jesus. Gandhi is trying to illuminate our dark age, by the same light that shone 2000 years ago."

Iswar Saran, India, also spoke:

"The problem of the freedom of India is not a British problem alone, but a world problem. The foundations of society are crumbling because founded on force, not on love. India wants to be the mistress of her own household. The problem is psychological rather than political. India wants to stand among the free nations of the world, so as to be able to make her contribution to the life of mankind."

Charles Baudouin, a Swiss Professor, read an exquisite poem, entitled: "Purna." I regret I can not give it here. He also gave a brief address on "Non-Violence."

"The theory of 'non-violence,' which has assumed such prominence through Gandhi's campaign, is no innovation, but an attitude familiar to the Indian mind, as is proved by secular and millenary tradition (for instance, the dialogue of Buddha and Purna). In the West this attitude has come to light only in rare and isolated cases: in the life of a Francis of Assisi, in the doctrine of a Tolstoy. Nevertheless, these isolated Western fires

must not be despised, for their influence has sometimes reached as far as Asia itself. Ramakrishna recites with joy the cantiques of St. Francis, and we have a very striking correspondence between the old Tolstoy and a little lawyer by the name of Gandhi—especially the letter of September 7th, 1910 (two months before Tolstoy's death), which is a veritable last will and testament in the moral sense, in which the old man passes on the torch to the young one. However that may be, the real home of non-violence is undoubtedly India.

"What is the significance of non-violence? Surely, *its complete faith in the power of the spirit.* Nothing more, and yet so much. It regards spiritual forces and the power of love as real forces, in the full sense of the term, capable of holding their own against the material forces of muscle, arms or machinery. It acts upon this faith, and proves it to be true. And herein lies its message for us: even if we profess to be Christians or spiritual people, we do not *really* believe in the practical power of the spirit as these people do. For our science has taught us the measurable and inevitable reality of material forces; but science knows nothing about the spirit; it knows of it only as a breath. In psychology, it is true, science has taken the first step forward; psychology is revealing to us the power of the spirit at work in its influence on health and sickness. But science must go a step further; it must recognize that these forces carry decisive weight in determining social history. This is the fact which the policy of non-violence in India is demonstrating to us in so striking a way." (Charles Baudouin.)

And *Romain Rolland* (who lives at Villeneuve, at the head of the Lake) was there, like Gandhi, in spirit. His sister, Madeleine Rolland, came bearing a message, his ill health not permitting his coming. She read the message.

The Christ of India

"The cause of India is not merely that of a great nation—a human continent—the common source of the languages and ideas of Europe, the original root from which have sprung the strong and varied trees of our European civilizations. We are not merely filially interested in its destinies, its awakening, its desire for independence. So many other peoples are being shaken by this legitimate spirit of revolt, and are asserting their right to guide their own destinies. One may say that, all over the world, over the tombs where the ancient nations have been lying in chains, a breath has passed, a summons: *Lazarus arise!*

"But of all the nations, the exceptional fact about the awakening of India—which outside of all reason or political passion has made its cause our own—is not so much the aim which India is pursuing; the self-government of a great people, or a United States of Indian races and peoples; it is rather the *means* which it employs in pursuing this aim; its active spirit; its mission; the holy man who embodies it; the *Mahatma* of Non-Violence—Gandhi, the hero and saint of the *Satyagraha.*

"He has come in the blackest hour of history, when the principles by which the Western civilizations were upheld have been undermined. The tottering European world is giving itself up to the old, unrestrained animal instincts, served by all the destructive means offered by advanced science. Immediately after a frightful war of four years, and on the threshold, not of a war, but on ten interdependent wars which will not leave a single neutral state—surrounded by these menaces, as it were between the waves of the Red Sea towering up on either side and ready to fall down and engulf humanity, sits the frail sage of India, the second Buddha. He is alone; and by the mere fact of his non-participation, calm, inflexible, even to death, he commands the respect of brute force. This old man has merely to threaten to fast unto death, and the proudest Empire is forced to its knees—a victory which years of fighting would not have achieved; for all armed victories bring death and undying bitterness. For the first time the European world has been given an actual example, by this St. Thomas who believes nothing but facts, a triumphant example of what Gandhi himself has called *'the sword of self-sacrifice.'* For the first time, Gandhi has made this triumphant experience, in his own eyes and in the eyes of the whole world, an experience which he has been maintaining in theory since 1920. He has rediscovered on a large scale the experience of the *Rishis,* of whom he has said that *'in discovering the law of non-violence, in the midst of violence let loose they were greater geniuses than Newton, greater generals than Wellington. They themselves had used arms and realized their futility; and they now taught a tired world'* the tremendous effects of *'non-violence in its dynamic form; which means: the conscious suffering of the whole soul, in its resistance to the will of the tyrant. A single individual,'* he added, *'acting according to this fundamental law, could defy the whole power of an unjust empire, in order to save his honor, his religion, his soul,'* the soul of his people or his liberty, and *'later on would be able to bring about the fall of that empire and its regeneration.*

"The fact has been put to the proof. Not against any particular state. *All* the European states are equally guilty of injustice and wrong-doing. A Christ has proved this, for the salvation of all mankind. But no one can be saved unless he wants to be saved. Does the world want to be saved? Will salvation be possible now, when cracks are appearing in the last dykes which still hold back the devastating flood? The world must not delude itself into thinking that it will be able to prolong the *status quo!* We must act. We must change the corrupt social order, which is only upheld by iniquity. There are only two ways of inaugurating a new order: Violence and Non-Violence. Both are Revolutions. Choose between them. (Romain Rolland.)

And so the Christ walks the streets of Geneva and along the Shores of the Lake, bringing Peace and Salvation! Who will open the door, before he passes by?

SYDNEY STRONG.

Geneva, Switzerland.

Help India's struggle for freedom by non-violence! Help us offset British propaganda and meet Gandhi's request for moral support from America.

Join the American League for India's Freedom, John Haynes Holmes, chairman.

Tear off and return:

American League for India's Freedom
383 Bible House
New York City

Count me in as a supporter of India's struggle for independence. Here are my membership dues $.....

Name .....

Date .....Address.....

Subscribe to

The New Humanist

The November-December issue:

"BOURGEOIS APOLOGIA"
Theodore B. Brameld

"FORTY YEARS OF IT"
Preston Slosson

"CALIFORNIA LANDSCAPE"
Julia N. Budlong

"HUMANISM AND THE EVANGELICAL TRADITION"
F. S. Kinney

"AN AIM FOR AMERICAN EDUCATION"
Brent Dow Allinson

"AN AMERICAN LITERARY FOUNDATION"
Carl Henry Grabo

"THE EVOLUTION OF HUMAN BEHAVIOR"
Maynard Shipley

"KARL BARTH"
Werner Petersman
Harold Buschman

Other Reviews and Notes

SPECIAL

The New Humanist will be sent for one year together with a copy of Joseph Walker's "Humanism as a Way of Life" for $1.75.

Subscription yearly $1.00, single copy 20c.

THE NEW HUMANIST

105 S. Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.